LE COPY

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 19 1958
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1958

No. 376

In the Matter of

ABRAHAM TEITELBAUM, an attorney,

Petitioner.

Petition for Rehearing of Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Illinois.

ABRAHAM TEITELBAUM,
609 Hillcrest Road,
Beverly Hills, California,
Petitioner, Attorney Pro Se.

Parker & Son, Inc., Law Printers, Los Angeles. Phone MA. 6-9171.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1958
No. 376

In the Matter of

ABRAHAM TEITELBAUM, an attorney,
Petitioner.

Petition for Rehearing of Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Illinois.

Comes now Abraham Teitelbaum, attorney *pro se*, and petitions this Honorable Tribunal for a rehearing on his Petition for a Writ of Certiorari which was denied by this Court on November 10, 1958.

The reasons for the rehearing of his petition are based upon the fact that petitioner did set up a right, title and an immunity under the Federal Constitution. The question below was not one peculiarly involving state law since the State of Illinois does not have a State Income Tax Law, and the Federal Courts had already decided the only issue. Petitioner in taking exception to the Committee's findings on page 70 of Record in the Court below, stated: "Exception 4: The Commissioners erroneously rejected exhibits 1 to 14 inclusive tendered by respondent." This included the Decision of the United States District Court.

On page 71, Exception No. 6 states, "The decision of the U. S. District Court was improperly rejected and refused."

On page 73, Exception No. 15, "The Committee is seeking by this action to have the Judges of the Illinois Su-

'preme Court review and reverse the Findings of the Federal Courts."

The certified copy of the Decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals was made a part of the Record in the Court below.

How much more excepting could petitioner have made for the Record?

The only fact remaining is that this Decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois actually overrules both the decisions of the United States District Court, and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Both forums of the United States Courts decided that petitioner committed no act involving moral turpitude. Why should a state court afterwards take it upon itself to decide conversely, and refuse to honor the decisions of the Federal Courts? This is the only question involved in the case at bar.

The cases cited by my adversary are not applicable to this issue, and only last year in two cases cited by petitioner, this Honorable Tribunal held that the practice of law is a property right and a license which is entitled to be protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Can a state court without any reason disfranchise, revoke, or suspend the license of an attorney to practice law? In the humble opinion of the petitioner this question should be answered in the negative. In the instant case, the Federal Courts' decisions were *res adjudicata*.

The decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois should in justice be reversed.

Respectively submitted,

ABRAHAM TEITELBAUM,

Petitioner, Attorney Pro Se.

Certificate.

United States of America)
) ss.
State of California)

Abraham Teitelbaum, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that he prepared the within petition for rehearing which is subscribed to by him, that said petition is presented in good faith and not for any delay; and the contents of the petition is confined and restricted to facts which were not replied to; and in the interest of justice; and for the preservation of the dignity of the decisions of the Federal Courts the within petition has been prepared.

ABRAHAM TEITELBAUM

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of November A. D. 1958.

MARGUERITE F. CRIPPS
Notary Public in and for the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
My Commission Expires Jan. 3, 1960.